

March 28, 1934

LR 1

made only in the odd numbered years which would seem to preclude making appropriations in the even numbered years. But then the Constitution goes on and says that you can make further appropriations for deficiencies. Now what if we wanted to add money to an appropriation, Senator Warner, if you are changing the Constitution in this manner and the Constitution specifically speaks of appropriations, is this going to create the danger of not being able to do that?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Now you are on.

SENATOR WARNER: In response, Senator Beutler, no, it does not preclude change in deficiency by definition of statute, any change in the existing appropriation up or down, none of those things are precluded at all.

SENATOR BEUTLER: By definition of statute?

SENATOR WARNER: Mmm, hmm.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Has that statute ever been tested, Senator Warner? A statute can't dictate what the Constitution says as you know.

SENATOR WARNER: Well I...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Deficiency to me...

SENATOR WARNER: ...quite agree with that, Senator, but deficiency, at least by precedent for a great many years is any change in any fashion of budget.

SENATOR BEUTLER: An upward change is a deficiency.

SENATOR WARNER: Either direction. Deficiency does not mean reduction.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Hmm, I'm going to have to go back to my dictionary. That one is a little wild.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, it is not wild, Senator Beutler. That is a statute. Some years ago we were having a lot of